3. Discussion on the Resolution seeking disapproval of the Capital Issues (Control) Repeal Ordinance, 1992 and consideration and passing of Capital Issues (Control) Repeal Bill, 1992, as passed by Lok Sabha.

STATEMENT BY PRIME MINISTER

Ram Janam Bhoomi-Babri Masjid Dispute

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Prime Minister will make a statement now. Hon. Members, the copies are being distributed. The Prime Minister will make his statement on the issues which were making our Members so agitated that we could not do any other business in the House. We will have the clarifications at 3.30 because I have got a very long list of Members seeking clarifications.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO): Madam, the Ram Janma Bhoomi—Babri Masjid dispute has been agitating the minds of all those who believe in the values of secularism and governance based upon Constitutional principles. During the last few weeks, the developments at Ram Janma Bhoomi—Babri Masjid complex have been unfolding rapidly. The order of the Lucknow Bench of the Allahabad High Court dated 15 July was a watershed in the series of recent developments. The High Court, in its interim order, restrained the parties from undertaking or continuing any construction activity on the 2.77 acres of land which had been notified by the Government of Uttar Pradesh for acquisition. The Court also directed that if it was necessary to do any construction on the land, prior permission from the Court would be obtained.

While the Government of Uttar Pradesh repeatedly assured the Government of India as also the National Integration Council that they would undertake to have the orders of the High Court implemented, the construction activity at the Ram Janma Bhoomi—Babri Masjid complex continued.

The non-implementation of the High Court orders created misgivings among the people. This matter came up for consideration before the Supreme Court in a writ petition. During the hearing of the petition on 22 July, 1992, the Supreme Court called for suspension of the construction work of any kind on the acquired land.

In a further affidavit filed by the Government of Uttar Pradesh in the Supreme Court on 23 July, 1992, the State Government unconditionally undertook to obey the orders passed by the Supreme Court and by the Allahabad High Court. It was further mentioned in the affidavit that the suggestions made by the Supreme Court at the time of the hearing on 22 July, 1992 had given a new dimension to the negotiations which had been going on between the State Government and the religious leaders. The Government of Uttar Pradesh assured the Supreme Court that the State Government was using all means at its command to ensure that an agreement is reached by all parties concerned so that the orders of the Court are effectively implemented. The affidavit, *inter-alia*, referred to the invitation given by me to the leaders of the religious groups to meet me for discussion on 23 July, 1992.

In the light of the submissions made by the Government of Uttar Pradesh, the Supreme Court adjourned the hearing of the petition to Monday, 27 July, 1992. The Supreme Court said, *inter-alia*, that exploring a solution to this problem is in the larger national interest.

I am sure all the right thinking people will share the concern of the Central Government to find an amicable solution to the problem. The Central Government believes that all avenues of amicable settlement must be sincerely explore in the first instance. Our effort, therefore, has been to defuse the situation, avoid a confrontationist approach, and to bring about reconciliation of views of various concerned parties. While doing so, we have been acutely conscious of the importance of upholding the dignity of the judiciary and respect for the rule of law. It was on this basis that we had repeatedly urged the Government of Uttar Pradesh and all other concerned parties to abide by the directions of the

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

Court, both in letter and spirit, and not to do anything which will undermine the basic principles of the Constitution.

As was stated in the Congress manifesto, we are committed to finding a negotiated settlement of this issue which fully respects the sentiments of both communities involved. If such a settlement cannot be reached, all parties must respect the order and verdict of the Court. The Congress is for the construction of the Temple without dismantling the Mosque.

It was the responsibility of the Government of Uttar Pradesh to ensure that the orders of the Court are implemented and the construction activity on the acquired land is stopped. However, the situation was allowed to escalate to a point where the State Government expressed its inability to do anything and in fact requested that either the Home Minister or I should persuade the Sants and Mahants to stop the work. In view of the critical situation which had come about at Ayodhya, I had a meeting with the religious leaders on 23 July, 1992. During the discussion, I drew the attention of the delegation to the serious situation created by the non-compliance of the Court orders by the Government of Uttar Pradesh. I also informed the delegation that I would be in a position to begin the process of dialogue only after the construction activity comes to a halt. Finally, I requested the religious leaders to see that the work is stopped so that efforts to solve the Ram Janma Bhoomi-Babri Masjid dispute etc. could thereafter be proceeded with, in a time-bound manner. I also told them that once the work is stopped, I would revive the efforts initiated by the previous Governments that had remained usfinished, plus the preliminary soundings I have been making for some time past. The purpose of this exercise is to bring about an amicable settlement through negotiations. In case it becomes necessary, the litigation pending in various Courts on the subject could be consolidated and considered by one judicial authority, whose decision will be binding on all parties. This would require a fairly elaborate exercise at Government level and appropriate submissions to the Courts for their consideration. I expressed my belief that this exercise at Government level could be expedited and completed with 4 months' time. I found agreement on this approach.

The construction activity on the acquired land at the Ram Janma Bhoomi-Babri Masjid complex is reported to have ceased on 26 July. I hope this will pave the way for arriving at an agreed solution of the problem and bring about an amicable settlement of this long-standing issue. I therefore appeal to all political parties and all sections of the people to help in strengthening the traditional values of religious tolerance and in maintainging peace, tranquility and communal harmony.

1.00 P.M.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, clarifications. Shri Subramanian Swamy. I would request hon. Members, I have a very long list. We have been discussing only this and no work really for the past many days. Therefore, please put pointed questions.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY (Uttar Pradesh): I will be brief. I will ask very pointed questions.

Madam, I may, with your permission, say that there is a widespread consensus in the country that the Prime Minister has done well in this crisis and I hope that he will continue to receive strength from Parliament to find a solution to this problem.

I have only two questions to ask. Firstly, the present defusion of the crisis has been achieved by getting certain assurances of non-construction by the *sadhus*, most of whom belong to the Vishwa Hindu Parishad. I would like to know from the hon. Prime Minister, how can he be sure that they will stick to this agreement in view of the fact that they violated an earlier agreement? There was an agreement earlier, on 27 September, 1989—I have the text of the agreement with me here—signed by the then Chief Minister of U.P., in the presence of Mr. Buta Singh, the then Home Minister, and signed also, jointely, by Shri Ashok Singhal, Shri Dau Dayal Khanna, Mahant

Aviadnath and Shri Nrityagopal Das. Among other things, it said the following in writing: 'The VHP undertakes to abide by the directive of the Lucknow Bench of the Allahabad High Court given on 14-8-1989, to the effect that the parties to the suit shall maintain the *status quo* and shall not change the nature of the property in question and ensure that peace and communal harmony are maintained. Now this written assurance has been violated by the Hindu Vishwa Parishad. That is quite clear. I would like to know what steps the Prime Minister is taking to see whether even after this verbal commitment in fact, on ground they are not engaged in such construction in a clandestine manner. Now my second question is, and this is my last question, in view of the Supreme Court's view that a solution should be found to the problem, whether the Prime Minister will consider the letter written by Mr. Rajiv Gandhi as Congress President to the then Prime Minister Chandra Shekhar in which he had suggested that under section 3 of the Commissions of Inquiry Act a Commission comprising five Judges of the Supreme Court should look into the question whether there was indeed a temple which was demolished to build a Masjid. This is in view of the fact that the Muslim organisations have stated a number of times that if it can be conclusively established that there was indeed a temple which was demolished to build a Masjid it would be against Koran to read 'namaz' there, and they themselves would join in the effort to remove that Masjid and build the Temple. I would like to know whether he would consider acting on the basis of this suggestion made by Mr. Rajiv Gandhi in his letter of 2nd December, 1990.

SHRI SURESH KALMADI (Maharashtra): Madam, at the outset I would congratulate the Prime Minister on his patience on a serious matter like the Babri Masjid-Ram Janmabhoomi issue. Now we have got about 4 months to defuse the situation and we sincerely hope that a solution would be found in the next four months.

Madam, in the last two weeks it has been very clear that Ayodhya has been in the grip of the Vishwa Hindu Parishad and the Bajrang Dal. Ayodhya is like an island where the writ of the U.P. Government does not run. The police are bystanders. No one has a free access to Ayodhya. Unless the Bajrang Dal or the VHP leaders allowed, nobody could go there. I would, therefore, like to know, in view of the Supreme Court's decision, what steps are being taken by the Central Government to ensure free access to Ayodhya from now onwards. Already threats have come out from the Bajrang Dal that two-three days after the 4 months' ultimatum is over construction would start again. Shri Singhal has also said in a Press conference that the Vishwa Hindu Parishad is going according to the plan. These are very provocative statements. I hope they would abide by the Court's decision and they would genuinely act in the spirit in which the Prime Minister has said that he would like to discuss the matter with them and they would be having an open mind on the issue.

I would also like the Prime Minister to tell us what happens to the construction which has already taken place, that is *chabutra*, 4 feet high concrete structure, after the Supreme Court gave its decision that this should not be constructed; whether we intend demolishing it or it will continue to be there in spite of the Supreme Court's order.

Also about seepage through the trenches that have already been dug water has started seeping. Some of the learned people have expressed anxiety that the seepage might go into the foundation of Babri Masjid. I would also like to know whether the idols which were removed when the Vishwa Hindu Parishad and the Bajrang Dal razed the Hindu temples, are in safe custody.

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN (Tamil Nadu): Madam, I also congratulate the hon. Prime Minister for having resolved this issue for the time being. As has been reported in the Press, in three months or as he has reported, in four months' time,

[Shri G. Swaminathan]

this matter will be decided. But one point that I may like to ask the Prime Minister is regarding the press reports giving the version of Mahant Awaidyanath, M.P., I think, at Lucknow—as reported in *The Hindu*—and also the version of Mr. Singhal who also spoke to the correspondents at the same press conference. Both these people say what was the nature of the discussion that the sadhus and sants and the organizations had with the Prime Minister. Mahant Awaidynath, M.P. the top leader of the Ram Janambhoomi movement, has said that according to him the Prime Minister has assured that the Union Government would approach the Supreme Court for the constitution of a Special Bench or a Committee to go into the question whether a temple existed at the site where the present Ram Janambhoomi—Masjid structure stood and, if yes, whether the structure was raised after demolishing the temple. He has further said, if such a conclusion is arrived at, then the Ram Janambhoomi temple will be constructed at that place. I think from the statement which he has given, it appears that if such a decision is given by the Court, most probably the masjid also may be removed and the temple constructed on that land. That is the tenor of the discussion he had with the correspondents as reported not only in *The Hindu* but also in the *Indian Express* The same view has also been stated by Mr. Singhal. He has stated that the verdict would be binding. Then Mr. Singhal was asked if a verdict was given by the Court that originally there was no temple, what would be his solution to the problem, whether he would abide by it, he said that the verdict would be binding only on the Union Government; there is no way anybody on earth could come to the conclusion that the disputed strucutre is not the *Janamsthan*; if, for any reason, such a conclusion is reached, the whole country will deal with such a situation. He has also stated that, as reported by *The Hindu* Madam, again...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If you ask the question...

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: I am asking if the Prime Minister has had such a discussion with them, because that is worrying me. Again, Mr. V. R. Krishna Iyer also...

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Madam, just one minute. I have no objection in answering any number of questions for any length of time, but I would like to submit to the House that the scope of the statement which I have made is, limited. There was something coming in the way of a solution and also something which amounted to at constitutional question. So, that was the first hurdle to be crossed, and the discussion which I had with the mahants was confined only to that. What I told them is that I would sart the exercise. So, all the questions which are being raised here will be part of that exercise. I have not given any ruling or a decision or an assurance or anything. I only said that I will start the process. The process was started by the previous Governments. It remained unfinished. So, I think we will be able to solve it or continue the work done by them which remained unfinished, and this is all. So, whatever is being asked by way of details—what do you have to say to this, what do you have to say to that?—I have nothing to say to any of these things because they will be part of the discussions, negotiations, with political parties, with leaders, with institutions, all over the country. This will be a part of the exercise. So, I am afraid these questions are premature and I will not be able to respond to them right now.

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: Madam, I only want to know because these press reports have come. It is giving a seriously conflicting opinion and it is exercising our mind because, under the overall approach of the discussion, not one has said it, but the Mahant has said it, Mr. Singhal has said it, and no less a person than the ex-Judge of the Supreme Court, Mr. V. R. Krishna Iyer, has given a statement yesterday on the *Independent Initiative*—and what he means by that I don't know. He has said that the only contention is not about the disputed area but whether

there was a temple or shrine of the Hindus at the site where the whole or any part of the Masjid has been situated. It is, therefore, assured under the proposal by the P.M. yesterday, if the highest court in the land concludes that there was a temple at that site, then the Muslim community would willingly agree to the removal of the mosque and handing over the site to the appropriate authority. On the other hand, if the Court concludes that there was no temple at the site, constitutional orders for possession and removal of the idols must be passed. This is what Justice Krishna Iyer has also stated. The three people, to the Press, have stated about the overall approach that the Prime Minister should take. It has also been said by the hon. Member, Mr. Subramanian Swami. This is also one of the questions—I do not know whether it is going to be examined—whether a Rama temple was there. Yesterday three noted archaeologists have also stated that there was a temple there. Somebody says that there was a temple about 1 B.C. Somebody else says that there was a fort in the Kushan period. So, all this would mean that supposing this matter is going to be referred to the court, if the court tomorrow comes to the conclusion that there was a Rama temple, then, a temple may be allowed to be constructed on that land. We want a clarification on that from the hon. Prime Minister because we are exercised in our minds over the fact that such a statement has been made by the Prime Minister.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Swaminathan, ...

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: Madam Deputy Chairman, I once again congratulate the hon. Prime Minister. We will always stand by him. We are happy that this matter has been taken up by him. We are happy that this matter has been taken up by him and that the catastrophe has been avoided.

उपसभापति : आप कुछ कह रहे हैं ।

श्री पी० वी० नरसिंह राव : हां ।

उपसभापति : बोलिए ।

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I would only appeal to the hon. Members. This is a serious and sensitive matter, I have no answers to the questions being raised here because the answers we all have to find together. This is an exercise in which everyone, everybody has to take part.

It was a very limited purpose for which I invited them. They were coming in the way of stoppage of the work. The Uttar Pradesh Chief Minister said, "I cannot shoot the *sadhus* down." Any other course on the part of Government, Government of India, would have landed it with the task which the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh refused to do, and I thought that it was not in the interest of the country. That is how I called them, and they were persuaded to stop the work.

Now the question is whether they are going to stick to it or not and what is going to happen. We have four months' time. Four months' time was given to one of the previous Governments also. In fact, when I said "four months," they said, "Don't say 'four months.' It is a jinxed thing. Four months' time was given to another Government, but nothing was done." So, I said it could be ten days less. This is how we brought time, number one; we brought peace, number two; and we committed ourselves once again to an amicable solution which is what hte manifesto and all of us agree with. The exercise has to start now. This statement of mine in Parliament may be taken as the first step in that exercise.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member, we have a procedure in the House that on a *suo-motu* statement you ask clarifications. The Prime Minister has very categorically clarified that what he has said in his statement is the first step. Whatever you say, maybe, will be in his mind also when he will have further discussions. If each one of you is going to ask questions which he cannot at the moment

[The Deputy Chairman]

answer because the process is still going on, there would be no point in our going ahead with this. It you have any suggestion, you can make.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: *The constructions has stopped.*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The construction has stopped. That he has said in his statement just now. That he has said very clearly.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: It is reported to have stopped. That is the report I got... (*Interrputions*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Just a minute. Let me handle it in a proper, orderly manner.

I am thankful to Members who are very co-operative. I am thankful to them. It is a very very sensitive issue. It has made the House not to function for a whole week. So, the Members are keen, and the Prime Minister is here with something very positive before the House. Now, if you still feel that you want to ask questions, you may do so. But the Prime Minister has made if very clear that he can't answer them. You may put questions. Well, he might consider them later when he discusses them. That may be the only answer which can be given. But there is no point in expecting him to answer them at this point. Now, I will call according to the order. But there should be no discussion.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV (Maharashtra): Madam, there should not be any clarification.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI M. M. JACOB): If any reaction is there from any Member, that may be sought.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I would rather modify it. If there are any suggestions in the minds of the Members who are involved or are concerned wi this problem, they may give them the Prime Minister. He may consid it in his further discussion. Let hi do it that way. I will now call accor ing to the order. Shri N. E. Balaran

SHRI N. E. BALARAM (Kerala I appreciate the position, because of us are very much worried about t recent development in Ayodhya. I a very glad that the V.H.P. have stopp the construction work for some tim According to newspaper reports th have decided to stop it for three month Anyway, it is a welcome step, accordi to me, but I do not know whether t Prime Minister can answer my questio People who had been doing some con truction work in that disputed area wer not prepared to stop it even after th Allahabad High Court judgement. F the last two weeks, practically speakin they were not abiding by the court d cision. The work they were doing, the were doing it illegally. I don't kno with whom the Prime Minister has spo ken during his discussions. Some name of *Sadhus* and saints appeared in th papers. I don't know whether he has spo ken to the leader of the V.H.P. also What was their attitude?

There are only two solution to thi problem. I really agree with the solu tion suggested. Either the solution ca be found out by direct talks by consul tations with both the sections. Tha way they can find some solution. O both parties should agree to the cour decision. Anybody can agree on th first point. Of course, you can discus it and settle the matter. But on the second point, about the decision of the court, it was being challenged or ques tioned by one section throughout fo the last three or four years. Now, I do know whether they have changed thei attitude. If they have changed it and if they are prepared to abide by the court decision, I think it would be a very welcome step and would be good for the country. I would like to know from the Prime Minister if he can answer my point just now? What was the attitude of the section with which he was dealing on this matter, on the question of the court decision? Did they show

any indication or willingness to abide by the court decision if the matter goes to the court?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He cannot answer.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV: How can be answer now?

SHRI N. E. BALARAM: I don't know. I cannot answer. I am putting the question to him, not to you. (*Interruptions*) If you don't want me to ask any question, I would sit down.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, Mr. Balaram, that is not the point. (*Interruptions*) Don't interrupt. Mr. Afzal, please.

आप भी बैठ जाइए। मैंने आपको परमिट नहीं किया है। प्रधान मंत्री जी यहां हाउस में आए हैं।

He made his point very clear. He gave a statement on whatever he did, whatever has happened and what the factual position is at this point of time. The Prime Minister has very clearly said that he cannot predict what would be the future at this point of time. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Madam, you are setting a new procedure. Let to PM give his clarification as per his choice. But Let us not be deprived of our right to seek clarifications.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Nobody is depriving you. I am very sorry to hear such an allegation. You don't hear me properly. That is the whole tragedy. When I make any statement, ten Members speak. I said after the statement still you can ask clarifications so that you can help the Prime Minister in his future negotiations. I never said "no" to you. So don't make such an allegation and allow it to go on record that the Deputy Chairman did not allow you. I do not want to be quoted wrongly. I am the one person who would like the discussion to go on because we have not done any business for one week. We have got a whole backlog of the business to be transacted. Please don't interrupt. Ask your questions quietly. Let the Prime Minister take note of them.

SHRI N. E. BALARAM: What is my position? Can I continue?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, Sir, you may continue.

SHRI N. E. BALARAM: Madam, we are spending Rs. 2000 per minute.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes. So no Interruptions.

SHRI N. E. BALARAM: I fully agree with the statement made by the Prime Minister, especially with para 7. It says that there are only two solutions. One is negotiated settlement. Second is to abide by the court decision. I agree with that. The Prime Minister had several rounds of discussions with so many people on the one side but I do not know whether he had any discussions with the other side. According to the newspaper reports, he had held discussions only with one side. He did not meet the other side. That is a different thing. The side with which he had held discussion, has he got any idea about them to the second solution? May I know from the Prime Minister whether they would abide by the court decision? This is my simple question. I am not depending upon any prediction or on any hypothesis. I am putting a straightforward question. Did they indicate their mind to this particular question? For the last six years a theory is going round the country, violating the Constitutioin, questioning the Supreme Court's judgement, that this question cannot be solved by the court. This is one theory. That is why I am asking whether they have changed their mind, whether they have shown any indication of change in their mind. That is my question. If there is such a change, then, it is quite welcome. That is good for the country. That is what I am asking.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sukomal Sen. Mr. Balaram has said just now that every minute costs the Parliament Rs. 2000.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN (West Bengal): Madam, Mr. Jaccob has said that if any Member wants to make any suggestions, he is free to do so. The difficulty is what has happened in the last few days was a deal between the Prime Minister on the one hand and the BJP and the VHP on the other. Though the entire country was concerned about it...

SHRI MADAN BHATIA (Nominated): He is not seeking clarifications. He is casting aspersions against... (*Interruptions*)...I object to it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please don't make any insinuations. We are not having a debate...(*Interruptions*)...I will control it.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: He has no right ...(*Interruptions*)...

He said "You are making a deal"...(*Interruptions*)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is a very, very sensitive issue. It is beyond the purview of this House also...(*Interruptions*)...

मैंने आपको इजाजत नहीं दी, बैठिए ...(**व्यवधान**)

I don't want any noise.

एक मिनट सिकन्दर बख्त साहब, मैं आपसे इल्तिजा करूंगी एक मिनट बैठिए ... (**व्यवधान**)

Just a minute. Your making any insinuations will have grave results. The Prime Minister has come before the House with a statement in a good spirit. I humbly request you to go in the same spirit. To find a permanent solution to this problem, please help us.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra): It has got to be expunged.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Don't worry. I will expunge it. I will do my duty.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: Madam, I very much agree with you that it is a very, very sensitive and a delicate issu The entire country was concerned wi it. All the political parties were ver much concerned with it. But during t parleys none of us were taken into co fidence. All the political parties wer ignored...(*Interruptions*)..

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: N cross-talking. I would say anythir which is going to hurt anybody is n going on record. Please be very, ver careful.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: The press ha reported that the Prime Minister ha talks with the leaders of the BJP. A the Prime Minister said he had hel discussions with the religious leaders.

What about the other political par ties which are existing here? What ab out Parliament? Nothing was discussed Nobody was consulted. That is why made my position clear.

Now, Madam, the Prime Minister ha said many things in his statement. Bu what happened? They started constructio on the disputed land and, on the 15t July, the Lucknow Bench of the Alla habad High Court cleared the positio that without permission no constructio could be undertaken. But they did no bother about it. They were goin through the construction. Then th Supreme Court came into the pictur after a petition. On the 22nd July, the Supreme Court made the position very clear that unconditionally they should stop it. What happened then ? Yesterday, about 4 o'clock, the perss reported that they had stopped the construction. For the last ten days they had continued with the construction. Now, they have completed a six-foot high 'chabutra'. They have constructed a rectangular base for the . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What is there is there. You ask your questions now.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: I am coming to the point.

The first phase of the construction is already over. Now, after the talk with the Prime Minister, they have shifted

the construction work to a different site which, they say, is undisputed, for building a Lakshman temple. This is how those people who are responsible for the construction are moving. Their main motive, their main purpose, has been served. They have shown to the people that .....

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You are asking the Prime Minister, not those pesople. Please ask the Prime Minister.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: I am asking the Prime Minister because the Prime Minister has dealt with the matter.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do not talk about the other people.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: The parties concerned have shown to the people that they have done what they wanted and they will do it bit by bit in proper time. Madam, they have not even obeyed the Court order at that time. Now, the VHP supremo and even the BJP Supremo have declared openly that if the Court order goes against their will, they will not abide by it, they will not follow it. The BJP supremo has declared that no power on earth can resist their construction work. These are the perceptions of two outfits. Has the Prime Minister taken into account these perceptions, these public pronouncements, by the BJP and VHP that they are not going to stop the construction if the Court order goes against them?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, the clarification time is over and I have to adjourn the House for lunch. We will take it up later.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: I am concluding.

उपसभापति : अच्छा कनक्लूड कर लीजिए आधे मिनट में . . **(व्यवधान)** आधे मिनट में बोल दीजिए . . . **(व्यवधान)** बोल दीजिए ना ।

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: Madam, on one side, the Prime Minister is discussing with them and on the other, he has said that he will continue the work left unfinished by the earlier Prime Minister. What is the work? Both the sides will present proof, archaeological proof, whether the Ram temple existed or not. The Prime Minister has also said that if possible, if necssary, all the material will be collected and sent to the Court in a composite manner so that the Court gives a verdict. What is the Prime Minister thinking? What is in his mind? I want to know whether he will follow the archaeological proof whether it is Ram temple or not. I would like to know whether it is at all possible to prove it because archaeologists themselves are divided on it. So many papers have come out, so many documents have come out, so many opinions have come out.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, you put your question.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: I am coming to the question.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You take a very long time to come to the questions. In between how much of money is wasted !

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: Madam, for the last 12 days, they had undertaken the construction work despite Court orders and you are not allowing me even ten minutes to tell this.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am allowing you. I have allowed you. But you don't allow me to run the House.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: Madam, I am not disobeying any order

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, we have to adjourn the House. We will have it again at 3.30 p.m. *(Interruptions)*. I have allowed you, Mr. Sukomal Sen. We will take up the clarifications on the Prime Minister's statement at 3.30 p.m. The House is now adjourned for lunch till 2.30 p.m.

The House then adjourned for lunch at thirty-five minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at thirty-three minutes past two of the clock, **[The Vice-Chairman (Shri M. A. Baby) in the Chair.]**

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. A. BABY): We shall take up the Short Duration Discussion· Shri Gurudas Das Gupta—absent. Shri Shankar Dayal Singh.

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION

Likely Closure of certain public sector undertakings due to scarcity of funds and disinvestment of their shares by the Government

श्री शंकर दयाल सिंह (बिहार) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे इस बात से आज खुशी हो रही है कि पिछले एक सप्ताह से लगभग यह महत्वपूर्ण विषय राज्य सभा की कार्यसूची में जोड़ा जा रहा था और एक सप्ताह से हम लोग इस बात की प्रतीक्षा कर रहे थे कि कब यह आए इस सदन के सामने और सच्चाई को प्रस्तुत किया जाए । आज जाकर यह मौका मिला है । जिस विषय पर चर्चा की अनुमति प्रदान की गई है सरकार उससे अच्छी तरह से उसकी गम्भीरता से परिचित होते हुए भी अपरिचित है । निधियों के अभाव के कारण सरकारी उपक्रमों में से अधिकांश के बंद होने की आशंका और संभावना है और दूसरी ओर ...

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra): Sir, the Minister concerned is not present· (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. A. BABY): I think Mr. Jacob will see to it. The hon. Member raised this issue that the concerned Minister is not present in the House. You may kindly try to see to that without much delay· (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SHANKAR DAYAL SINGH: No, first I want that the Minister should come here. I thought, perhaps, the Minister is here. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): The Minister was here right from the morning. (*Interruptions*) The Minister of State for Home Affairs is also here.

SHRI SHANKAR DAYAL SINGH: No, no, no. It is a very serious matter. The Minister should come here. Without the Minister concerned here I am not going to proceed with it· What is this? This is a mockery. ...(*Interruptions*)... It seems the Government is not serious at all. ...(*Interruptions*)... No, no. this is not the way. The Ministe concerned is not here...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI V· NARAYANASAMY: Two Ministers are here. Two ministers are sitting...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI SHANKAR DAYAL SINGH: The Government is not at all serious Therefore, Sir, I want you to give a ruling that the Minister concerned should come here just now. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN (Tamil Nadu): He should come. He should come·

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA (Karnataka): Perhaps, he might have mistaken that the clarifications would continue.

(*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. A. BABY): Shankar Dayalji, let Mr. Jacob speak. ...(*Interruptions*)... Please, sit down. Just a minute. Let the Minister clarify.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI (M. M. JACOB): The Minister is on his way. He is coming. The Minister is on his way. Meanwhile, in order to continue our functioning another Minister here is taking note of what you have said. The Minister concerned is just coming. He is on the way.

SHRI SHANKAR DAYAL SINGH: he comes. I want that it should go on record. Sir, I request you to adjourn the House because the Minister concerned is not here. The Government is not